



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/657,956	09/08/2000	Eva Prpic	JP920000170US1	1771

7590 12/19/2003

International Business Machines Corporation  
Almaden Research Center  
650 Harry Road  
San Jose, CA 95120

EXAMINER

ZHONG, CHAD

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2003

S

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/368,829	02/19/2003	Daniel Reich	6190.62001	5376

34282 7590 12/19/2003

QUARLES & BRADY STREICH LANG, LLP  
ONE SOUTH CHURCH AVENUE  
SUITE 1700  
TUCSON, AZ 85701-1621

EXAMINER

PATEL, RAMESH B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2121

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/657,956

Applicant(s)

PRPIC ET AL.

Examiner

Chad Zhong

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-8 are presented for examination.
2. It is noted that although the present application does contain line numbers in specification and claims, the line numbers in the claims do not correspond to the preferred format. The preferred format is to number each line of every claim, with each claim beginning with line 1. For ease of reference by both the Examiner and Applicant all future correspondence should include the recommended line numbering.
3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:  
  
The specification is replete with terms which are not clear, concise and exact. The entire specification should be revised carefully. Examples of some unclear, inexact or verbose terms used in the specification are:
  - \* organisation (pg 3, line 30) (i.e. does the applicant mean organization?).
  - \* continuos (pg 8, line 1) (i.e. does the applicant mean continuous?).Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph***

4. Claims 2-4, 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
  - a. The following terms lack antecedent basis:
    - i. said immigration department – claim 3.
    - ii. said system – claim 8.
  - b. The claim language in the following claims is murky or not clearly understood:

Art Unit: 2154

- i. As per claims 2, line 1; claim 3, line 1; claim 4, line 1, it is not clearly understood whether “a method” refers to “a method” in claim 1, line 1 (i.e. if they are the same, the word such as “said” or “the” must be used);
- ii. As per claim 6, line 1; claim 7, line 1; claim 8, line 1, it is not clearly understood whether “Apparatus” refers to “a Apparatus” in claim 1, line 1 (i.e. if they are the same, the word such as “said” or “the” must be used);

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States

6. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by “Fairfield Ponte Vedra Decals and Access Cards” (hereinafter Fairfield), 17 June, 1998.

7. As per claims 1 and 5, Fairfield teaches a method of accrediting participants to an event, said method comprising the steps of:

collecting information from each of said participants (pg 1, lines 13-14);

producing a non-valid pass for each of said participants (pg 1, lines 13-14);

issuing respective non-valid passes to said participants (pg 1, line 14);

upon arrival of each participant at, or proximate an event venue, validating said non-valid pass, thereby accrediting said participant (pg 1, lines 11-12, lines 30-31).

Art Unit: 2154

8. As per claim 2, Fairfield teaches upon arrival of each participant, verifying information of said participant before said non-valid pass is validated (pg 1, lines 11-12, lines 30-31).

9. As per claims 4 and 7, Fairfield teaches ascribing an accreditation class to each of said participants; and ascribing privileges to each of said accreditation classes (pg 1).

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claim 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Fairfield Ponte Vedra Decals and Access Cards” (hereinafter Fairfield), 17 June, 1998.

12. As per claim 8, Fairfield does not teach wherein said system is a distributed system comprising interconnected servers and workstations. However it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention to include a series of servers and workstations in a distributed manner because doing so would be essential to get Immigration’s system operational as an automated network oriented architecture.

13. Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Fairfield Ponte Vedra Decals and Access Cards” (hereinafter Fairfield), 17 June, 1998, in view of De La Rue “Angolan National Identity Solution” (hereinafter De la Rue), 1999.

14. As per claims 3 and 6, Fairfield teaches the method for foreign participants and before arrival

Art Unit: 2154

of participants, sending a bulk request to an Authority (pg 2, lines 16-21), and receiving a status from said department, allowing said validated pass to serve as a form of entry (pg 1, lines 30-31).

15. Fairfield does not teach sending a visa request to immigration authority and receiving a visa status from said immigration department, allowing said validated pass to serve as a visa.

16. De la Rue teaches wherein sending a visa request to immigration authority and receiving a visa status from said immigration department, allowing said validated pass to serve as a visa (paragraph 1-3).

17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Fairfield and De la Rue because they both dealing with validation process prior to entry to an area. Furthermore, the teaching of De la Rue to sending a visa request to immigration authority and receiving a visa status from said immigration department, allowing said validated pass to serve as a visa would expand the functionality for Fairfield's system by expanding the authentication and validation technique at the immigration check points.

### *Conclusion*

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to "Accreditation of Personnel".

- |      |              |                  |
|------|--------------|------------------|
| i.   | US 6,035,280 | Christensen.     |
| ii.  | US 4,882,779 | Rahtgen.         |
| iii. | US 5,841,886 | Rhoads.          |
| iv.  | US 6,408,331 | Rhoads.          |
| v.   | US 6,456,984 | Demoff et al.    |
| vi.  | US 5,737,701 | Rosenthal et al. |


- vii. US 6,129,275 Urquhart et al.
- viii. US 4,851,651 Gaucher.
- ix. US 5,949,046 Kenneth et al.
- x. US 6,636,833 Flitcroft et al.
- xi. US 5,548,106 Liang et al.
- xii. "DE LA RUE GIVES SINGAPORE THE 'MIDIS' TOUCH Singapore Immigration & Registration Department Chooses De La Rue Identity Systems to Provide Automated Passport Production System" Dec. 02, 1998
- xiii. "Cards & Personal Identification Technical Committee" July, 2000.
- xiv. US 2002/0070863 Brooking.
- xv. "Armed Services Commissary Regulations" (ASCR), James L. Elmer August 3, 1990.
- xvi. "European Committee for Banking Standards", January 1996.
- xvii. "Meal Card Program", Air Force Instruction 34-241, November 1, 1997.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0718. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 703-305-9678. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

CZ  
October 31, 2003

  
MENG-AL T. AN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100  
MENG-AL T. AN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100